

Languages and Cultures in Research and Education
pp. 209–218

Michał NÉMETH
(Kraków)

**The Role of Borrowing Routes in Defining Loanwords
as Hungarisms in Polish Dialects**

The debate on Hungarian loanwords in Polish has been going on for many years and began in 1888 when I. Halász published the first part of his article entitled *Magyar elemek az északi szláv nyelvekben* [= Hungarian elements in the Northern Slavic languages] which dealt with Hungarian words found first and foremost in Slovak, but also in Czech and Polish lexicon. This early study, although written with good etymological intuition, bestowed very little attention to the borrowing routes of Hungarian words, in most cases simply enumerating their Slovak, Czech and Polish equivalents, but rarely attempting to elucidate their historical or phonetic backgrounds of the borrowing-mechanisms. Later on the same broad definition of Hungarism is observable in the works of such Polish scholars as L. Malinowski (1893) or even A. Brückner (1907, 1917a, b) where the lists of “Hungarian loanwords” contain practically all the words that Polish and Hungarian lexicon commonly possess (and obviously not being Slavic loans into Hungarian) regardless of the real donor language.

In subsequent years the question of borrowing channels was described in more detail, although they were not always fully appreciated in etymological research. A good illustration of this is A. Zaręba’s article (1951), where the author mentioned the fact that the lexical material presented by him could be grouped according to the borrowing routes as well (Cf. Zaręba 1951: 123), but he completely neglected this criterion when discussing the loanwords. Moreover, he claimed that the majority of Hungarian loanwords in Polish were taken directly from Hungarian without any mediation (Zaręba 1951: loc. cit.). *Nota bene*, this assertion directly contradicted what J. Reychnan claimed in the same year, namely that the overwhelming majority of the relevant lexicon was loaned via, first and foremost, Slovak, Ukrainian or

Romanian mediation and that only a certain group of cultural words (connected, for example, to warfare or administration) originate directly from Hungarian (Reychman 1951: 204–207). The most recent work, attempting to compile the entire Hungarian lexical material can be found in Polish (both dialectal and used in literary language), is the monograph by R. Wołosz published in two parts in 1989 and 1992 which is not, however, free from these kinds of shortcomings either.¹ Even if the author points out on the first pages of his work that the discussed material contains also words loaned from Hungarian via other mediating languages (i.e. from Slovak, Ukrainian) and mentions that these are “of course formally Slovak, Ukrainian &c. loanwords” (Wołosz 1989: 217), the Slovak, Ukrainian etc. material has been taken into account slightly selectively.² In addition, in the second part of his work the author concludes – apart from the Slovak, Ukrainian etc. material compiled in the work – that, again: the majority of the Hungarian loans in Polish were taken directly from Hungarian without any mediation (Wołosz 1991–1992: 17).

The latter statement has to be revised in the light of the fact that the lexical material examined by all of the above-mentioned authors must be divided into two groups containing, on the one hand, words used in literary language (this group contains mostly historical and cultural terms) and, on the other hand, dialectal words used in the area where in the past mutual linguistic Hungarian–Polish contacts have taken place.³ We will focus on the latter.

Given the fact that within the borderland referred to above, the intensive contacts of the local Polish-, Slovak- and Hungarian-speaking elements within the population resulted in relatively complex borrowing-mechanisms, one might easily assume that this section of Polish dialectology has already been described in detail. However, again not enough wide-ranging research has been undertaken in order to trace back this group of Hungarianisms in Polish. For more than one hundred years the only monograph dealing with Hungarian lexical elements in Polish dialects was the above-mentioned work of L. Malinowski published in 1893. Unfortunately while the title of Sokołowska’s article sounds promising (see references, 2003), the article itself is rather disappointing and adds no valuable data to the relevant matter; it only

¹ While discussing the relevant bibliography we deliberately did not take a closer look at papers describing smaller parts of the lexicon in question, such as (to mention the more important ones) Kniezsa (1934), Śluszkiewicz (1951), Sulán (1964), Stachowski (2002b).

² The bibliography lacks, for example, the six-volume dictionary of the Slovak language (SSJ) and some other relevant publications (e.g. Gregor 1970, Schubert 1982) providing further Slovak lexical material which could have thrown new light upon the etymological commentaries of such Polish words as *baciara* ‘rascal’, *boczkor* ‘outsize, old shoe’, *bunkosz* 1. ‘thick sheep-crook’; 2. ‘boor’, *galer* ‘collar’, *chotar* 1. ‘village’s border’; 2. ‘big field’, *kocz* ‘carriage’, *korbac* ‘whip’, *pipasur* ‘pipestem’, *szalas* ‘simple hut used as temporary shelter, usually made of wood’ &c.

³ This concerns first and foremost the Polish *Orawa*, *Spisz* and *Podhale* region, i.e. the former borderland between Hungary and Poland.

enumerates nineteen lexemes with a brief etymological commentary attached – not being free, in many places, from conspicuous lacunae. Needless to say, having only a few titles in its references, it fails to provide a good etymological summary.

Recently this situation changed as a monograph discussing the Hungarian elements in the Orawa-dialect was published, compiled by the present writer (Németh 2008).

Before we begin describing the role of borrowing routes in defining loanwords as being Hungarian we must briefly present at the outset the most frequent schemes⁴ (as they were presented in the above-mentioned works) in the terms that we shall use in our discussion:

- A) Pol. (< Slk. ~ Ukr. &c.) < Hung.
e.g. *bakańcie, bojtár, gombik, hasen*
- B) Pol. (< Slk. ~ Ukr. &c.) < Hung. < SCr. < Ott. < Pers.
e.g. *baciár ~ beciár, gazda, pajtasz, ziwań*
- C) Pol. (< Slk. ~ Ukr. &c.) < Hung. < It. < Lat. < Gr.⁵
e.g. *burginia, ceduła, ceruzka, somar*
- D) Pol. (< Slk. ~ Ukr. &c.) < Hung. < Germ.
e.g. *boczkor, fakla, galer, korchel*

Without doubt, not mentioning possible or definite mediating languages leads to omitting a link in the word-history, which is just as important as finding its final origin. Moreover, in most cases – in order to verify every single detail of a given etymology – the question of the mediator is simply essential. There is no escaping the fact that the phonetic, morphologic or semantic features of a loanword are to be explained mostly by the closest etymon only (see the examples given below);

⁴ These schemes obviously do not present all of the possible routes of borrowings. This can be illustrated by a small group of words being of non-Ottoman Turkic origin loaned via Hungarian (and possibly other mediating languages) into Polish, e.g. Pol. dial. *ciawa ~ tiawa* 'camel' < Slk. *táva* id. < Hung. *teve* id., Pol. dial. *koldosz* 'beggar' < Hung. *koldus* id., Pol. dial. *segin(ica)* 'beggar women' < Hung. *szegény* 'poor' (for. (Kiptchak-) Turkic origin of the enumerated Hungarian words cf. respectively EWU 1515, EWU 76, Berta (2005), Stachowski (2002a). Additionally, one may find words the history of which presents a separate model, e.g. Rom. *plăcintă* 'pancake' > Hung. *palacsinta* id. > Slk. *palačinka* id. > Pol. dial. *pałacynka* id. Last but not least, however, internal Polish borrowings (between dialects and between dialects and literary language) may also have taken place, but we did not specify them in the sketches since we usually do not have philological evidence unquestionably proving them. Besides, we believe that a Slovak word taken from, for example, the *Podhale* to the Orawa region remains a slovakism in the Orawa-dialect since Polish and its dialect should be treated in this case as a whole.

⁵ The B) and C) sketches present, of course, several models each: in B) we have words being ultimately of Hungarian, Serbo-Croatian, Ottoman and Persian origin while C) contains all words finally being of Hungarian, Italian, Latin or Greek provenience.

moreover, finding the direct donor language is a much more reliable criterion than settling for the final source. Consequently, one should define as Hungarisms only those words which were taken directly from Hungarian and – logically – one cannot find any linguistic evidence inevitably proving mediation.

In view of what has been said above: (1) Pol. dial. *meru* '40' cannot be classified as a Hungarism loaned into Polish from Hung. *mérő* 'measure; an old Hungarian measurement of volume, which value varied according to the region it was used – used for expressing quantity of such loose materials as e.g. wheat' (cf. e.g. MNyÉS Sz VII 1277–1279) because undoubtedly the change of the final vowel (*-ő* > *-u*) took place in Slovak (similarly to e.g. Hung. *kettő* '2' > Slk. *ketu* id., cf. Gregor 1975: 443–445; Rocchi II 24), cf. Slk. (1554) *meru* '40' (HSSJ II 287); (2) the Polish dialectal word *gombik* 'button' cannot be treated as a Hungarian loanword since the diminutive suffix *-ik* has been attached to Hung. *gomb* 'button' on Slovak ground, cf. Slk. *gombík* (1589) 'button' (Gregor 1993: 38, 40; Rocchi I 106); and finally (3) the polysemic word *golyr* used in the Polish Orawa dialect can be considered only partly as a Hungarism, merely in the meaning of 'a part of a cow's neck from its muzzle to breast', while in the more common meaning of 'collar' it was loaned into Polish – in all probability – via Slovak mediation, cf. Slk. *golier* (1629) 'collar' (HSSJ I 381) and Hung. dial. *gallér* (1901) 'fur or feathers around animals' neck' besides the original meaning (1395) 'collar' (< MHG. *goller* ~ *koller* 'a part of the armour protecting the neck; ruff', EWU 443). These few examples are enough to show that in many cases we can find linguistic criteria clearly distinguishing Slovak, Ukrainian etc. loanwords from those which are indubitably Hungarian.⁶

While searching for the answer to the question why in early Polish works the question of mediation was neglected it is difficult to resist the statement that for Slavists or Polonists the Hungarian origin in many cases seemed to be simply more attractive than Slovak, Ukrainian or Romanian. Moreover, while within these works the Hungarian origin was emphasised, in many cases Polish dialectologists simply did not take into account works published in Hungarian. This established a kind of etymological tradition: a certain number of words erroneously – according to the definition given above – interpreted as Hungarisms were repeatedly added to such works and, consequently, not mentioning them in new publications gave the impression of omitting a considerable part of the relevant lexicon.

On the basis of the above facts theoretically it would be possible to present a transparent classification of the lexicon in question in terms of which one could show precisely which language was the donor language. But then one can find a good many Polish, Slovak, Ukrainian, Hungarian or Romanian words not differ-

⁶ These criteria (phonetic, morphologic and semantic) are obviously not the only ones used to elucidate the origin of Polish dialectal words. Several other non-linguistic sifting criteria may be listed here – examples being the *negative criterion* (i.e. the simple fact if the word in question appears in any possible mediating language; if not: we can assume that the word was borrowed directly from Hungarian), geographical and cultural criteria.

ing from each other much or having exactly the same phonetic shape; moreover, in many cases the Hungarian word would be adopted in Polish phonetically in the same way as it would have been taken via a mediating language (first and foremost in Slovak). Furthermore, in most cases chronological evidence also does not allow us to reach definitive conclusions (as is usually the case in etymological research and especially in dialectology) and should therefore be treated as being merely supportive. The latter, finally, concerns also semantic criteria (in many cases the meaning does not change, or the relevant lexemes differ only slightly) as well as morphologic features. Therefore, in most cases we cannot provide phonetic or semantic, let alone morphologic criteria to distinguish the donor language.

May the following few examples suffice to corroborate what we have said above: (1) Pol. dial. *cyga* 'pulley' could be originated from Slk. *čiga* (1650) id. as well as from Hung. *csiga* (?1272, ca. 1395) id.; (2) the same holds true of the Pol. dial. *fajt* 'sort, breed' in the light of similar Slovak and Hungarian word forms: Slk. dial. *fajt* id. (SSN I 436, SV I 245) and Hung. arch. *fajt* (1693) id. (TESz I 830); (3) as well as of Pol. dial. *bojtár* 'shepherd' which the etymon might be both Slk. *bojtár* 'herdsman' and Hung. *bojtár* 'young herdsman', etc.

In the light of the above-mentioned etymological difficulties perhaps it would be more appropriate to define this part of the Polish lexicon as *slovak-hungarisms*. This group of words would contain loanwords brought into Polish via Slovak territories and, simultaneously, those in respect of which we cannot distinguish if the Slovak- or the Hungarian-speaking population has been the mediatory one. Separating this kind of loanword layer would make it easier to classify this type of words, for it is difficult to classify e.g. Pol. dial. *ciardaś* 'csardas, a lively Hungarian national dance' as a possible Slovak loanword (cf. Slk. *čardáš* id., see SSJ I 192) as we know that morphologic⁷ and – obviously – cultural reasons argue in favour of Hungarian provenience. The proposed term would be more suitable as we know that the great part of the population of the former Upper Northern Hungary was bilingual, and that it is Slovak- and Hungarian-speaking.

This brings us back to the question of the "etymological tradition" we have mentioned above, as we have to stress that in some cases placing a Polish word into the group of, for example, Slovak loanwords but not mentioning its Hungarian background may be rather inappropriate. This can be illustrated by the etymology of Pol. dial. *ceruzka* 'pencil': according to our definition the word is not a Hungarism since it was not taken directly from Hung. *ceruza* id. but via Slk. dial. *ceruzka* ~ *céruska* id. (SSJ I 163, SSN I 203). The Slovak diminutive suffix attached to the Hungarian word supports this presumption.⁸ But a closer examination of the word's

⁷ Hung. *csárdás* ← Hung. *csárda* + -s [-š] 'derivative suffix'.

⁸ However the Polish diminutive suffix could have been attached to the Hungarian basis as well, we believe that it happened on Slovak ground. This is much more probable in the light of the lack of Pol. dial. **ceruza*, contrary to Slovak where *ceruza* id. is also attested (SSN *ibid.*, SSJ *ibid.*).

cognates, present in various languages, in the meaning of ‘ceruse, white lead’ and its etymology,⁹ shows that the meaning of ‘pencil’ emerged in Hungarian, and consequently, the word is characteristic of the Hungarian language area. Hence, this semantic argument to some degree justifies adding this word to works dealing with Hungarisms. We may define this kind of loanwords – again: in order to make the classification of such words easier – as *hungaro-slovakisms*.

Glossary of Polish dialectal words not explained in the text (with concise etymological commentary)

- baciar* ~ *batiar* ‘a men, usually a bachelor, leading an easy life; rascal’ < Ukr. *bétar* id. (Ukr. *báta* ‘father, old man’) < Hung. *betyár* ‘young man without employment; handsome youth’ < SCr. *bècar* ‘bachelor, young man without employment’ < Ott. بیکار *bekār* ‘bachelor, young man’ < Pers. بیکار *bikār* ‘without employment or profession; an idle, lazy fellow’; cf. respectively SGP, SUM, EWU, Škaljić (1973), de Meynard (1971), Steingass (1892), see also *beciar*.
- bagańcie* ~ *bakańcie* ‘laced sneakers made of leather’ < Slk. *baganče* ~ *bakanče* id. < Hung. *bakancs* ‘laced boot, ankle boot’; cf. respectively SGP, SSJ, EWU.
- beciar* ~ *betiar* ‘a men, usually a bachelor, leading an easy life; rascal’ < Slk. *beťár* ‘playful young man; rascal’ < Hung. *betyár* ‘young man without employment; handsome youth’ < [see *baciar*]; cf. respectively SGP, SSJ, EWU, see also *baciar*.
- boczkor* ‘outsize, usually old and worn shoe’ < Slk. *bačkor* ~ *bočkor* ‘simple leather boot’ < Hung. *bocskor* ‘kind of sandal, moccasin’ < MHG *botschuo* ‘kind of rugged boot’; cf. respectively SGP, HSSJ, EWU, Mollay (1982).
- bojtar* ‘shepherd’ < Slk. *bojtár* ‘herdsman’ < Hung. *bojtár* ‘young herdsman’; cf. respectively SGP, SSN, EWU.
- burginia* ‘sugar beet’ < Slk. *burgyňa* ‘beet; sugar beet’ < Hung. *burgonya* ‘potato’ < It. *Borgogna* ‘Burgundy’; cf. respectively Kaś (2003), SSN, ŪMTsz, EWU.
- ceduła* ‘banknote’ < Slk. dial. *cedula* ‘banknote’ < Hung. *cédula* 1. ‘a short, usually official note’; 2. ‘piece of paper’ < Lat. *cedula* ‘piece of paper; kind of official note’ (*dimin.*) ← Lat. *scheda* 1. ‘a strip cut off from the stalk of papyrus, which used to be glued together in order to gain papyrus leaf’; 2. ‘piece of paper’ < Gr. *σχέδη* ‘papyrus’; cf. respectively Kaś (2003), SSN, EWU, GLat, TGL.
- fakla* ‘torch used usually to frighten away wolves’ < Slk. *fakla* ‘torch’ < Hung. *fáklya* ‘torch’ (to be more precise: form earlier *fākla*) < Lat. *facula* ‘torch’ (*dimin.*) ← Lat. *fax* ‘torch’; cf. respectively Kaś (2003), SSN, EWU, TLL.

⁹ Cf. Eng. (arch.) *ceruse* ‘white lead’, Fr. *céruse* id., It. *cerussa* id., Lat. *cerussa* id. etc. The final etymon of the word is Gr. *κηρουσσα* ‘being of wax, covered in wax’, cf. TGL IV 1527 (s.v. *κηρός*) – without the accentuation being indicated. EWU 164 notes a reconstructed Gr. **κηροῦσσα* here, however, as we can see turning to TGL, one can find the word attested. The meaning of ‘white lead’ appeared in Latin.

- gazda* 'a person who owns house and land; landlord' < Slk. *gazda* 'farm foreman; owner; husbandman' < Hung. *gazda* 'head of the household; farm foreman; landlord; smallholder' < SSlav. **gospoda* 'coll. lords, sires, members of higher class'; Kaś (2003), SSJ, EWU, SłPrasł.
- hasen* 'profit, benefit; advantage' < Slk. *chasen* 'benefit' < Hung. *haszon* 'profit, benefit', cf. respectively Kaś (2003), HSSJ, EWU.
- korchel* 'hard drinker' < Slk. *korhel* 'drunkard' < Hung. *korhely* 'drunkard' (precisely form earlier *korhel*) < HG. *chorherr* 'canon'; cf. respectively Kaś (2003), SSN, EWU, DW.
- pajtas* 'small, spry child' < Slk. *pajtáš* 'friend, fellow; prankster' < Hung. *pajtás* 'friend, fellow, mate' < SCr. *pajdaš* 'mate' < Ott. *paydaş* 'the one who shares one's faith; partner'; cf. respectively Kaś (2003), SSN, EWU, Skok (1971), Kakuk (1973).
- somar* 'donkey' < Slk. *somár* 'donkey' < Hung. *szamár* 'donkey' < It. dial. *somàr* ~ *sumàr* 'donkey' < Lat. *sagmārius* 'a pack animal' < Lat. *sagmarium* 'weight, saddlebag' < Gr. *σα(γ)μάρι(ov)* 'packsaddle (put on horses or donkeys)'; cf. respectively Kaś (2003), SSJ, EWU, DELI, GLat, TGL.
- ziwań* 'layabout, lazy person' < Slk. *živáň* 1. 'rascal, scallywag'; 2. 'robber' < Hung. *zsvány* 1. 'spiteful, despicable'; 2. 'thief'; 3. 'cunning person' < Ott. *جوان* *živan* 'handsome young man' < Pers. *جووان* *jiwwān* 'a youth'; cf. respectively Kaś (2003), SSJ, EWU, de Meynard (1971), Steingass (1892).

michal.nemeth@uj.edu.pl
Katedra Filologii Węgierskiej
Uniwersytet Jagielloński

Symbols

>, <	=	borrowing	←	=	derivation
↔	=	contamination	†	=	extinct word form

Abbreviations

arch. = archaic; **coll.** = collective; **dial.** = dialectal; **dimin.** = diminutive; **Eng.** = English; **Fr.** = French; **Germ.** = German; **Gr.** = Greek; **HG** = Early New High German; **Hung.** = Hungarian; **It.** = Italian; **KTkc.** = Kiptchak-Turkic; **Lat.** = Latin; **MHG.** = Middle High German; **Ott.** = Ottoman; **Pers.** = Persian; **Pol.** = Polish; **Rom.** = Romanian; **SCr.** = Serbo-Croatian; **Slk.** = Slovak; **SSlav.** = Southern Slavic; **Ukr.** = Ukrainian.

Abbreviated references

- DELI = Cortelazzo, M. / Zolli, P., 1990–1991, *Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana*, V, Bologna.
- DW = Grimm, J. / Grimm, W., 1860, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, II, Leipzig.
- EWU = Benkő, L. et al. (eds.), 1993–1994, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*, Budapest.
- Glat = du Cange, Ch. du Fresne, 1883–1887, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, I–X, Paris [first edition: 1678; new edition by Léopold Favre].
- HSSJ = Majtán, M. et al. (eds.), 1991–, *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka*, I–V [A–Š], Bratislava.
- MNyÉSz = Bárczi, G. / Országh, L. et al. (eds.), 1965–1966, *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára*, I–VII, Budapest.
- SGP = Karaś, M. / Reichan, J. (eds.), 1982–, *Słownik gwar polskich*, I–VI [A–D], Kraków.
- ŚlPrasł = Ślawski, F. (ed.), 2001, *Słownik prasłowiański*, VIII, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków.
- SSJ = Peciar, Š. (ed.), 1959–1968, *Slovník slovenského jazyka*, I–VI, Bratislava.
- SSN = Ripka, I. (ed.), 1994–, *Slovník slovenských nářečí*, I–II [A–Pov], Trenčín–Bratislava.
- SUM = Bilodid, I.K. et al. (eds.), 1970, *Slovník ukrajinského jazyka*, I, Kyjiv.
- SV = Halaga, O.R. (ed.), 2002, *Východoslovenský slovník*, I–II, Košice–Prešov.
- TESz = Benkő, L. et al. (eds.), 1964–1984, *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*, I–IV, Budapest.
- TGL = Stephano, H., 1831–1865, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, vol. 1–8, Paris.
- TLL = [Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque Germanicarum Berolinensis Gottingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vindobonensis], 1912–1926, *Thesaurus linguae latinae*, IV/1, Leipzig [the chief editor of the 4th volume was Georg Dittmann].
- ÚMTsz = B. Lőrinczy, É. (ed.), 1979–, *Új magyar tájszótár*, I–IV [A–S], Budapest.

Further references

- Berta, Á., 2005, Hungarian *koldul* ‘to beg’ and *koldus* ‘beggar’. – Siemienieć-Gołaś, E. / Pomorska, M. (eds.): *Turks and non-Turks. Studies on the history of linguistic and cultural contacts* (= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 10), Kraków: 49–55.
- Brückner, A., 1907, Wyrazy obce w języku polskim. – *Prace Filologiczne* 6: 1–55, 602–636.

- Brückner, A., 1917a, *Walka o język*, Lwów [see pp. 237–245].
- Brückner, A., 1917b, Wpływy języków obcych na język polski. § 11. Wpływy węgierskie. – *Encyklopedia polska*, II, section III (part I), Kraków: 100–153.
- Dezső, L., 1989, *A XVI–XVIII. századi kárpátukrán nyelvmélekek magyar jövevény-szavai*, Budapest.
- Gregor, F., 1970, Ung. *kocsi* ‘Wagen’ und die Namen ähnlicher Fahrzeuge sowie einiger Bestandteile im Slowakischen. – *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 16: 193–218.
- Gregor, F., 1975, A magyar labiális ö, ő, ü, ú hangok megfelelései a szlovákban. – *Magyar Nyelv* 71: 438–448.
- Gregor, F., 1990, Magyar eredetű szavak a szlovák szókincsben. – *Magyar Nyelv* 86/1–3: 180–192.
- Gregor, F., 1993, *A szlovák nyelv magyar elemeiből*, Budapest.
- Halász, I., 1888–1889, Magyar elemek az északi szláv nyelvekben. – *Magyar Nyelvőr* 17: 250–255, 300–307, 444–449, 495–500, 532–536; *Magyar Nyelvőr* 18: 212–216.
- Kakuk, Zs., 1973, *Recherches sur l’histoire de la langue osmanlie des xvi^e et xvii^e siècles. Les éléments osmanlis de la langue hongroise*, Budapest.
- Kąś, J., 2003, *Słownik gwary orawskiej*, Kraków.
- Knieza, I., 1934, Pochodzenie hungaryzmów karpackiej terminologii pasterskiej. – *Księga referatów. II Międzynarodowy Zjazd Sławistów (Filologów Słowiańskich). Sekcja I – Językoznawstwo*, Warszawa: 49–53.
- Malinowski, L., 1893, O niektórych wyrazach ludowych polskich. – *Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Wydziału Filologicznego Akademii Umiejętności* 2: 1–96 [see pp. 20–25: Ślady wpływu węgierskiego w mowie góralskiej na Podhalu tatrzańskim].
- de Meynard, A.C.B., 1971, *Dictionnaire Turc-Français*, I–II, Amsterdam.
- Mollay, K., 1982, *Német–magyar nyelvi érintkezések a XVI. század végéig*, Budapest.
- Németh, M., 2008, *Zapóžyczenia węgierskie w gwarze orawskiej i drogi ich przenikania*, Kraków.
- Reychman, J., 1951, W sprawie zapóžyczeń węgierskich w polszczyźnie. – *Język Polski* 31/5: 203–211.
- Rocchi, L., 1999–2010, *Hungarian Loanwords in the Slovak Language*, I–III, Trieste.
- Schubert, G., 1982, *Ungarische Einflüsse in der Terminologie des öffentlichen Lebens der Nachbarsprachen*, Wiesbaden.
- Skok, P., 1971, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, II, Zagreb.
- Słuszkiewicz, E., 1951, Na marginesie „Węgierskich zapóžyczeń”. – *Język Polski* 31/5: 196–203.
- Sokołowska, J., 2003, Leksykalne wpływy węgierskie na polskie gwary spiskie. – *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. Seria Filologiczna* 8: 112–122.
- Stachowski, M., 2002a, Das Ethnonym *Zigeuner*, sein slawisch-türkischer Hintergrund und ungarisch *szegény* ‘arm’. – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 7: 159–169.
- Stachowski, M., 2002b, Uwagi o wybranych etymologiach węgierskich w języku polskim. – *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 47/1–2: 45–52.

- Steingass, F., 1892, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, London.
- Sulán, B., 1964, Über die ältesten ungarischen Lehnwörter des Polnischen. – *Slavica* 4: 131–137.
- Škaljić, A., 1973, *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom-hrvatskosrpskom jeziku*, Sarajevo.
- Wołosz, R., 1989, Wyrazy węgierskie w języku polskim. – *Studia Slavica* 35: 215–317.
- Wołosz, R., 1991–1992, Wyrazy węgierskie w języku polskim II. – *Studia Slavica* 37: 3–27.
- Zaręba, A., 1951, Węgierskie zapożyczenia w polszczyźnie. – *Język Polski* 31/3: 113–125.

Zusammenfassung

Im vorliegenden Artikel wird versucht, durch die Analyse der in Frage kommenden Vermittlersprachen einige methodologische Aspekte des Problems darzustellen, welche polnischen (Dialekt)Wörter als direkte Entlehnungen aus dem Ungarischen zu definieren sind.